



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/928,565	08/13/2001	Elliot Karl Kolodner	GB920000101US1	7157

48115 7590 08/01/2005

HOLLAND & KNIGHT LLP
701 BRICKELL AVE
SUITE 3000
MIAMI, FL 33131

EXAMINER

SHAH, NILESH R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2195

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/928,565

Applicant(s)

KOLODNER ET AL.

Examiner

Nilesh Shah

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1 –34 are presented for examination

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-11, 23-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A computer system is not tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable. The claimed steps do not define a machine or computer implemented process (see MPEP 2106).
3. Claims 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. A method is not tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable. Specifically, as claimed, it is uncertain what perform each of the claimed method steps. Moreover, each of the claimed steps, inter alia, (providing, marking, detecting) can be practiced mentally in conjunction with a pen and paper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - a. A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
5. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wolczko et al (5,900,001) (hereinafter Wolczko) in view of Aman et al (6,694,346) (hereinafter Aman).
6. As per claim 1, Wolczko teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a computer system providing an object-based virtual machine environment for running successive applications, said computer system including storage, at least a portion of which logically divided into two or more heaps in which objects can be stored (col. 4 lines 1-20; col. 3 lines 59-67; col. 2 lines 56-66; col. 5 lines 1-5), said system including logic for marking a card whenever an object in its corresponding storage region is updated (col. 5 lines 2-30; col. 6 lines 1-11; col. 14 lines 21-52; col. 20 lines 33-60).
7. Wolczko does not specifically teach the use of resetting heap at applications.

Aman teaches logic for detecting possible references from the second heap the first heap at reset by scanning the cards in the card table corresponding to the second heap, and detecting any cards which have been marked (col. 2 lines 53-65; col. 3 lines 39-52). It

would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Aman and Wolczko because Aman method of resetting memory heaps after applications would improve Wolczko's system by allowing each heap to be cleared of previous application memory thus improving the overall system as taught by Aman (col. 5 lines 29-47; col. 6 lines 1-7; col. 2 lines 53-65; col. 3 lines 39-52).

8. As per claim 2, Wolczko teaches a computer system further comprising: logic for locating, for each marked card, any objects the corresponding region of storage(col. 5 lines 2-10); and

logic for identifying any references to the first heap in the located objects (col. 6 lines 55-67).
9. As per claim 3, Wolczko teaches a computer system further comprising: logic responsive to the identification of references the first heap for performing the mark phase(col. 5 lines 2-6) garbage collection to determine live objects in at least the second heap (col. 5 lines 41-50; col. 3 lines 40-67);

logic for detecting whether any objects in the second heap having references to the first heap have been marked as live(col. 5 lines 2-30); and

Aman teaches logic responsive to a detection of any such objects returning an error condition to prevent reset for another application (col.4 line 1-16).

10. As per claim 4, Aman teaches a computer system, further comprising logic for invalidating the card table if a compact operation has been performed on the second heap since the last reset(col. 2 lines 53-65), wherein said logic for performing the mark phase is also responsive to invalidation of the card table (col.4 line 1-16).
11. As per claim 5, Wolczko teaches a computer system, wherein an object only considered as within the region of storage corresponding card if a predetermined part the object is in that region (col. 5 lines 2-30).
12. As per claim 6, Wolczko teaches a computer system wherein the region memory corresponding to a card comprises between 256 and 2048 bytes (col. 5 lines 25-30).
13. As per claim 7, Wolczko teaches a computer system further comprising:
logic for detecting references or possible references to the first heap from a set of predetermined locations(col. 5 lines 2-30).
Amen teaches logic responsive the detection of any such references or possible references for returning an error condition prevent reset for another application(col.4 line 1-16).
14. As per claim 8, Wolczko teaches a computer system wherein said set of predetermined locations includes the stacks and registers (col. 2 lines 3-11; col. 3 lines 50-55).

Art Unit: 2195

15. As per claim 9, Wolczko teaches a computer system further comprising: logic for detecting any objects on the first heap which are reachable from virtual machine system class objects(col. 5 lines 2-20); and
16. logic for promoting any such detected objects to the second heap(col. 5 lines 10-30).
17. As per claim 10, Wolczko teaches a computer system including an object-based virtual machine environment for running successive applications, said computer system including storage, at least a portion of which is logically divided into two or more heaps in which objects can be stored (col. 2 lines 56-66; col. 5 lines 1-5), second heap persists from one application to the next, said system including: logic for identifying any objects on the first heap which have a finalization method (col. 5 lines 2-30). Aman teaches a logic for running the finalization methods of any identified objects on the main thread prior to reset of the first heap (col.4 line 1-16).
18. As per claim 11, Wolczko teaches a computer system further comprising logic responsive to running said finalization methods for checking that they have not performed any operations which would prevent reset of the first heap (col. 2 lines 53-65).
19. Claims 12-22 are rejected based on the same rejections as claims 1-11 above.
20. Claims 23-33 are rejected based on the same rejections as claims 1-11 above.

21. As per claim 34, Wolczko teaches a computer system providing an object-based virtual machine environment for running successive applications, said computer system comprising:

storage, at least a portion of which is logically divided into two or more heaps in which objects can be stored, wherein a first heap is reset between successive applications, and a second heap persists from one application to the next (col. 4 lines 1-20; col. 3 lines 59-67; col. 2 lines 56-66; col. 5 lines 1-5);

logic for marking a card whenever an object in its corresponding storage region is updated (col. 5 lines 2-30);

logic for locating, for each marked card, any objects in the corresponding region of storage; and logic for identifying any references to the first heap in the located objects;

logic responsive to the identification of references to the first heap for performing the mark phase of a garbage collection to determine live objects in at least the second heap;

logic for detecting whether any objects in the second heap having references to the first heap have been marked as live; and logic responsive to a detection of any such objects for returning an error condition to prevent reset for another application (col. 5 lines 2-30; col. 6 lines 1-11; col. 14 lines 21-52; col. 20 lines 33-60);

logic for detecting references or possible references to the first heap from a set of predetermined locations', and logic responsive to the detection of any such references or possible references for returning an error condition to prevent reset for another application (col. 5 lines 2-30; col. 6 lines 1-11; col. 14 lines 21-52);

Art Unit: 2195

logic for identifying any objects on the first heap which have a finalization method; and logic for running the finalization methods of any identified objects on the main thread prior to reset of the first heap col. 4 lines 1-20; col. 3 lines 59-67; col. 2 lines 56-66; col. 5 lines 1-5);

wherein an object is only considered as within the region of storage corresponding to a card if a predetermined part of the object is in that region; and wherein the region of memory corresponding to a card comprises between 256 and 2048 bytes; and wherein the logic for performing the mark phase is also responsive to invalidation of the card table (col. 5 lines 2-30; col. 6 lines 1-11; col. 14 lines 21-52; col. 20 lines 33-60).

Aman teaches logic for detecting possible references from the second heap the first heap at reset by scanning the cards in the card table corresponding to the second heap, and detecting any cards which have been marked (col. 2 lines 53-65; col. 3 lines 39-52)

Response to Arguments

22. Applicant's arguments filed 5/16/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant states 101 rejection is improper, however a computer system is not tangibly embodied in a manner so as to be executable. The claimed steps do not define a machine or computer implemented process. Applicant also states that motivational to combine Aman and Wolczko is improper. However, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Aman and Wolczko because Aman method of resetting memory heaps after applications would

Art Unit: 2195

improve Wolczko's system by allowing each heap to be cleared of previous application memory thus improving the overall system as taught by Aman (col. 5 lines 29-47; col. 6 lines 1-7; col. 2 lines 53-65; col. 3 lines 39-52).

Conclusion

23. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nilesh Shah whose telephone number is (571)272-3771. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

Art Unit: 2195

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571)272-3756. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nilesh Shah
Examiner
Art Unit 2195

NS
July 25, 2005

MAJID BANANKHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER

